

REMARKS

Specification Amendments. The Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct typographical errors. No new matter was introduced by the amendments of the specification herein.

Claim Amendments. The subject matter of claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10 has been amended herein to further particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10. The subject matter of claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10 has not been narrowed in scope by the amendments herein, and no new matter has been added to claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10.

Claim Objection. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Hollweg objected to claim 10 for being improperly dependent upon itself. The Applicant has amended dependent claim 10 herein to depend from independent claim 9. Withdrawal of the objection to dependent claim 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Hollweg rejected pending claims 1-10 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application:

- A. Examiner Hollweg rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0031026 A1 to *Tiesler-Wittig et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Hollweg's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 10 over *Tiesler-Wittig*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Tiesler-Wittig*. To warrant this § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 10, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9 must be either expressly or inherently described in *Tiesler-Wittig*. See, MPEP § 2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this

§102(b) rejection of independent claims 1 and 9, because *Tiesler-Wittig* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, “a portion (25, 26; 35, 36) of the surface of the outer bulb (21; 31) facing away from the discharge vessel (23; 33) is shaped as a negative lens” as recited in independent claims 1 and claim 9.

Specifically, the specification of the present application defines a negative lens being shaped in a portion of an outer bulb as resulting in the inner discharge vessel having a smaller virtual size than its actual size. See, U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/556,009 at page 2, lines 23-26; page 8, lines 10-21, and page 9, line 24 to page 10, line 2. A careful review of *Tiesler-Wittig* reveals that *Tiesler-Wittig* in fact teaches a pair of lens 30 for virtually shifting the location of a gas discharge 17 within a discharge vessel 16 without any reduction in a size of both gas discharge 17 and discharge vessel 16. See, Tiesler-Wittig at paragraphs [0014]-[0022], [0038]-[0040] and [0049]-[0053]. This fact is evidenced by both gas discharge 17 and discharge vessel 16 having the same size and shape in FIG. 1 (actual location of gas discharge 17 within discharge vessel 16) as in FIG. 1a (virtual location of discharge vessel 17 within discharge vessel 16 as shifted by one of the lens 30). Thus, *Tiesler-Wittig* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, the aforementioned limitation of independent claims 1 and 9.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Tiesler-Wittig* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 5-7 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2 and 5-7 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2 and 5-7 are allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Tiesler-Wittig* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 10 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 10 is allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *Tiesler-*

Wittig. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Tiesler-Wittig* is therefore respectfully requested.

- B.** Examiner Hollweg rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0031026 A1 to *Tiesler-Wittig* et al.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 3 and 4 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 3 and 4 are allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tiesler-Wittig* is therefore respectfully requested.

- C.** Examiner Hollweg rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0031026 A1 to *Tiesler-Wittig* et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0156984 A1 to *Vitt* et. al.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 8 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 8 is allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig* in view of *Vitt* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Tiesler-Wittig*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tiesler-Wittig* in view of *Vitt* is therefore respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Hollweg is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **May 25, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,
Johannes Petrus Maria Ansems

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Chris M. Ries
Registration No. 45,799
Attorney for Appellant

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

/Darrin Wesley Harris, 40636/
Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant